



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,443	12/03/2001	Yasumasa Mizushima	6640/66050	5171

7590 09/08/2005

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP
1185 Avenus of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

SUAZO, RAINIER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/008,443

Applicant(s)

MIZUSHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Rainier Suazo

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-25** are pending in this application.
2. The search was updated.
3. The Applicant's response submitted on 06/30/2005 is hereinafter referenced to as 'the submitted response'.

Response to Arguments

The objection to the Title of the Invention has been withdrawn, as per the submitted response (see page 2).

Applicant's arguments filed 06/30/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as per the following discussion.

Regarding Applicant's arguments in page 16 of the submitted response, Applicant argue that Owens et al does not teach that the message is used to distribute information among a plurality of traders at the plurality of sites. Examiner disagrees. Owens taught, or at least suggested, that the receivers are, in fact, plural receivers (column 2 lines 21-27, column 2 lines 2-8, column 5 lines 13-14 and column 10 lines 9-23). Moreover, there is no suggestion in Owens to limit a message to a single receiver, in contrast the e-mails taught by Owens are known in the art of electronic messaging to be send-able to plural recipients with different addresses and different receiving e-mail servers, which is commensurate with plural sites. Regarding the label of 'traders' that

Art Unit: 2144

the Applicant gives to the recipients, there is no substantial difference between a generic e-mail recipient and a recipient labeled 'trader'.

Regarding Applicant's arguments in page 16 of the submitted response, Applicant argue that Owens et al does not teach that the messages receiver taught by Owens is merely a human user and therefore not capable of executing a prescribed piece of reception processing. Examiner disagrees. Firstly, even in the abstract, it is appreciated that Owens disclosed a system for integrating electronic messages in different formats wherein it is inherently disclosed that the receiver of the message will need a client device to access the received messages. Secondly, referencing figure 1, it is appreciated that the human user pointed by the applicant is holding a telephone 24 (see column 6 lines 54-59) and it later (column 6 lines 59-65) stated that other interfaces are available. Additionally, see column 1 lines 38-40 and column 2 lines 31-36 in Owens, wherein the disclosure describes the requirement of a device capable of executing a prescribed piece of reception processing.

Regarding Applicant's arguments in page 17 of the submitted response, Applicant argue that Owens et al does not teach a message conversion part that executes message conversion and in particular processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated. Examiner disagrees. Owens taught the argued feature as pointed out in the First Office Action in page 3. Furthermore, in column 2 lines 44-57 and from column 5 line 59 to column 6 line 13 in Owens wherein reformatting and conversion

operation to be execute according message receiver's rules are explicitly disclosed. Additionally, see column 6 lines 26-33, column 7 lines 24-31, wherein the known preferences are inherently accumulated/stored; and column 10 lines 36-56.

Regarding Applicant's arguments in page 17 of the submitted response, Applicant argue that Owens et al does not teach that a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message. Examiner disagrees. Owens taught, or at least suggested, these features, for example, in column 8 lines 36-42. Moreover, Applicant admits in page 17 paragraph 1 of the submitted response that Owens "define forwarding options for the emails..."

Regarding Applicant's arguments in page 18 of the submitted response, Applicant argue that Owens et al does not teach a B2B connector that provides a messages exchange interface between a system and a site outside the system. Examiner disagrees. Owens taught, or at least suggests, the argued features in column 10 lines 49-56, wherein Owens clearly exchanges messages between systems. In column 10 lines 49-56, Owens recites:

*"The filtering rules (in accordance with the filtering options selected by the receiver) applied to the message are based on the sender's originating telephone number or e-mail address. The **forwarding** options available are determined by the type of message received from the sender (e.g., voice mail, fax mail or e-mail) and the alternate target device/address (e.g., pager, e-mail account, fax machine, voice mailbox)."*

which is commensurate with providing a message exchange interface.

Art Unit: 2144

Regarding Applicant's arguments in page 19, paragraph 2 of the submitted response, Examiner clarifies as follows. The processing of the messages is not performed by a person, but by an automated data processing system as appreciated, for example in figure 3.

Regarding the subsequent arguments related to a field serving as a trigger in a message format, it is appreciated that in column 8 lines 34-42, Owens describes automatic execution depending on the selected options, commensurate with a trigger. Moreover, Owens utilizes specific triggers, for example in claims 85-89.

As per the above discussion, the rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Owens et al. (**US 6,633,630**), hereinafter "Owens".

5. Regarding claim 1,

Owens taught an information processing apparatus for processing a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected via a network, the apparatus comprising: a message reception part that receives a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**); a rule accumulation part that accumulates a plurality of rules for executing message processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 24-28**); a message conversion part that executes message conversion processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated in the rule accumulation part (**abstract, figs. 1-2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); and a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**).

Owens further taught, or at least suggested, that the receivers are, in fact, plural receivers (column 2 lines 21-27, column 2 lines 2-8, column 5 lines 13-14 and column 10 lines 9-23). Moreover, there is no suggestion in Owens to limit a message to a single receiver, in contrast the e-mails taught by Owens are known in the art of electronic messaging to be send-able to plural recipients with different addresses and different receiving e-mail servers, which is commensurate with plural sites. Regarding the label of 'traders' that the Applicant gives to the recipients, there is no substantial difference between a generic e-mail recipient and a recipient labeled 'trader'.

Note that Owens disclosed a system for integrating electronic messages in different formats wherein it is inherently disclosed that the receiver of the message will need a client device to access the received messages.

Referencing figure 1, in Owens, it is appreciated that the human user pointed by the applicant is holding a telephone 24 (see column 6 lines 54-59) and it later (column 6 lines 59-65) stated that other interfaces are available. Additionally, see column 1 lines 38-40 and column 2 lines 31-36 in Owens, wherein the disclosure describes the requirement of a device capable of executing a prescribed piece of reception processing.

Owens further taught a message conversion part that executes message conversion and in particular processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated

Art Unit: 2144

in column 2 lines 44-57 and from column 5 line 59 to column 6 line 13; wherein reformatting and conversion operation to be execute according message receiver's rules are explicitly disclosed. Additionally see column 6 lines 26-33, column 7 lines 24-31, wherein the known preferences are inherently accumulated/stored; and column 10 lines 36-56.

Owens further taught a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message, for example, in column 8 lines 36-42. Moreover, Applicant admits in page 17 paragraph 1 of the submitted response that Owens "defines forwarding options for the emails..."

6. Regarding claim 8,

Owens taught an information processing method for processing a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected via a network, the method comprising the steps of receiving a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**); accumulating a plurality of rules for executing pieces of message processing (**abstract, figs.1-2 and column 7 lines 24-28**); executing message conversion processing according to accumulated by the accumulating step (**abstract, figs. 1 and 2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); the plurality of rules and executing a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**).

7. Regarding claim 15,

Owens taught a network system comprising: a message reception part that receives a message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**) to execute a prescribed piece of reception a rule accumulation part that accumulates rules for executing pieces of message processing (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 24-28**); a message conversion part that executes message conversion processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated in the rule accumulation part (**abstract, figs. 1-2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); and a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**).

8. Regarding claims 2, 9 and 16,

Owens taught a system further a part that starts a corresponding application on the prescribed server to execute message conversion processing when no suitable rules exist in the rule accumulation part (**column 10 lines 62-64**).

9. Regarding claims 3, 10 and 17,

Owens taught a system wherein the message conversion part converts the message into a prescribed format according to a transmission origin of the message and contents of the message (**column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 3, column 11 lines 51-61**).

10. Regarding claims 4, 11 and 18,

Owens taught a system, wherein the message conversion part specifies a transmission destination of the message according to a transmission origin of the message and contents of the message (**column 11 lines 56-61**).

11. Regarding claims 5, 12 and 19,

Owens taught a system wherein the message conversion part performs automatic protocol conversion according to a message transmission destination specified according to a transmission origin of the message and contents of the message (**fig. 9, column 2 lines 52-57, column 10 lines 52-56 and column 13 lines 63-65**).

12. Regarding claim 7, 14 and 21,

Owens taught a method/apparatus/network system comprising: a message broker that commits to an application processing of data (**abstract, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 22-24**) that becomes necessary when message conversion is performed among the plurality of sites (**abstract, figs. 1 and 2, column 7 lines 30-31 and column 10 lines 49-52**); a message translator that performs mutual conversion between message formats according to a prescribed conditional sentence in response to an arrival of a field serving as a trigger in a message format (**abstract, figs. 1 and 2, column 7 lines 30-31, column 10 lines 49-52, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 3, column 11 lines 51-61**) .; message router that adds a destination address to the message according to a prescribed piece of identification information contained in the message (**column 11 lines 56-61, figs. 1-2 and column 7 lines 28-30**); a B2B connector that provides a message exchange interface between a system and a site outside the system (**column 10 lines 24-61 and figs. 1,6 and 7-9**); and a gateway that provides a local message exchange interface between the system and a local site inside the system (**column 13 line 46 to column 14 line 15 and figs. 1 and 12**).

Owens further taught a B2B connector that provides a messages exchange interface between a system and a site outside the system in the form of forwarding options, in column 10 lines 49-56, wherein Owens clearly exchanges messages between systems. In column 10 lines 49-56, Owens recites:

*"The filtering rules (in accordance with the filtering options selected by the receiver) applied to the message are based on the sender's originating telephone number or e-mail address. The **forwarding** options available are determined by the type of message received from the sender (e.g., voice mail, fax mail or e-mail) and the alternate target device/address (e.g., pager, e-mail account, fax machine, voice mailbox)."*

which is commensurate with providing a message exchange interface.

Examiner clarifies that the processing of the messages is not performed by a person, but by an automated data processing system as appreciated, for example in figure 3.

Regarding the particular limitations related to a field serving as a trigger in a message format, it is appreciated that in column 8 lines 34-42, Owens describes automatic execution depending on the selected options, commensurate with a trigger. Moreover, Owens utilizes specific triggers, for example in claims 85-89.

13. Regarding claims 22-25,

Owens taught a system comprising parts for: receiving a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing (**column 7 lines 12-41**); accumulating a plurality of rules for executing the message processing (**column 7 lines 41-50 and column 8 lines 11-42**); executing message conversion processing according to a

corresponding one of the plurality of rules accumulated by the rule accumulation step **(column 8 lines 27-42)**; and executing a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message **(column 8 lines 36-42)**. Owens disclosure is related to networked environments with servers and computers (see **figure 4**), such equipment was well known in the art; and inherently used computer software, recording medium, computer program, computer executable readable medium and apparatuses (see for example **column 20 line 7**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens et al. (**US 6,633,630**), hereinafter "Owens" in view of Matsuo (**US 5,634,005**) hereinafter "Matsuo".

15. Regarding claims 6, 13 and 20,

Owens taught a system substantially as claimed, however Owens did not expressively teach that the message conversion part executes encryption processing that corresponds to a message to a transmission destination that is specified according transmission origin of the message and contents of the message.

Matsuo, in the same field of invention related to facilitate and automate transmission of electronic mail messages, taught conditionally using encryption for automatic messages processing using rules (**figs. 6-9 and column 9 lines 8-25**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the methods/systems of Owens with the teachings of Matsuo. Owens motivated the exploration of the art of electronic mail communication (**abstract, figs. 1-3 and column 7 lines 37-41**) and the use of rules to process messages (**column 8 lines 36-42**). The art exploration motivate by Owens is, at least in part, the subject matter of Matsuo (**see title, abstract field of invention and column 1line 40 to column 2 line 15**). The modification would improve Owens system by providing a system that receives a message and determine actions to be performed with the message and the message further transmission including using encryption procedures to send encrypted messages (**Matsuo, column 4 lines 50-57**) or decrypt a received encrypted message, therefore providing a more secure systems to protect end-users sensitive data.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rainier Suazo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00-4:30..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2144

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rainier Suazo, MBA
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2144

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER